



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/605,031 | 09/03/2003 | Chi-Feng Wu | REAP0006USA 2030 | |
| 27765 75 | 590 09/20/2005 | | EXAM | INER |
| NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION | | | TU, CHRISTINE TRINH LE | |
| P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD. | P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116 | | | PAPER NUMBER |
| , | | | 2133 | |
| | | • | DATE MAILED: 09/20/2009 | 5 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| , | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | 10/605,031 | WU, CHI-FENG | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Christine T. Tu | 2133 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. | | | |
| Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 S</u> | September 2003. | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under l | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4 | 53 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8 and 9</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 6</u> is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requirement. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>9/3/2003</u> is/are: a)□ a | | ne Examiner. | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | xaminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) |)-(d) or (f). | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been received. | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document | | on No | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio | | | | | |
| application from the International Burea | | • | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | of the certified copies not receive | ed. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | | latent Application (PTO-152) | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | | that Daniel Maria Daniel and an annual and | | | |
| Office Ac | ction Summary Pa | rt of Paper No./Mail Date 20050915 | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/605,031

Art Unit: 2133

Drawings

1. Figures 1-9 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(o). All features represented by boxes in the figures must be labeled with a term which indicates what element the boxes represent. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Page 3

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1:

At lines 9-10, the term "the clock tree quasi-balance characteristic" lacks antecedent basis. It is also not clear what actually is a clock tree-quasi-balance characteristic?

Claim 6:

At line 13, the term "the clock tree quasi-balance characteristic" lacks antecedent basis. It is also not clear what actually is a clock tree-quasi-balance characteristic?

Claims 2-5 and 7:

These claims are objected because they depend on claims 1 and 6 and contain the same problem of indefiniteness.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/605,031

Art Unit: 2133

4. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peeters et al. (6,393,592 and Peeters hereinafter).

Claim 8:

Peeters teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Peeters teaches (figure 3) that a scan flop (200) includes a scan multiplexer (202), a clock multiplexer (204) and a D flip-flop (210). The Scan multiplexer (202) is selectively controlled to pass either data D or scan data SI based upon the selection by the scan enable terminal SE. The clock multiplexer (204) is receiving the functional clock at the clock terminal C, and the scan clock at the scan clock terminal SC. The functional clock is selected when the scan mode terminal SM is set to a logical "0" and the scan clock is selected with SM is set to a logical "1" (figure 3, column 4 lines 40-55).

Peeters does not explicitly teach that the scan multiplexer (202) outputs the function input signal during logic operations and outputs the scan input signal during scan tests.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that Peeters' scan multiplexer (20) would output the data D when the scan flop is in the functional mode and would output the scan data SI when the scan flop is in the scan test mode. One having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to realize so because Peeters' scan multiplexer (202) is operative in responsive to the scan enable terminal SE (figure 3, column 4 lines 46-48).

Art Unit: 2133

Claim 9:

Peeters teaches that a scan chain is made up of a plurality of interconnected scan flops (figure 1B, column 1 lines 36-45).

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine T. Tu whose telephone number is (571)272-3831. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur. 8:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571)272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christine T. Tu Primary Examiner Art Unit 2133

September 16, 2005